

REPORT  
OF  
THE CHANCELLOR  
WITH REGARD TO THE  
SCHEME FOR CONFEDERATING  
UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.

---

Toronto :  
PRINTED BY THE GRIP PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO., FRONT ST.  
1885.

*The* EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE  
COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA



*Queen's University at Kingston*

# QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT ASSOCIATION.

---

OTTAWA, JULY 1ST, 1885.

SIR,—

I beg leave to invite your attention to the accompanying documents respecting Queen's University.

Those documents establish emphatically that the constituents of Queen's are substantially of one mind on the following points, viz :

1. That the scheme of University Confederation, recently submitted to the Trustees by the Minister of Education, is not favorably entertained by the graduates and friends of Queen's.
2. That it is manifestly in the interests of higher education in Canada that Queen's should not abdicate her position as a University and enter into a union of Colleges carrying on work in Toronto under Toronto University.
3. That Queen's should for ever remain at Kingston as a University.
4. That every effort should be made to increase the efficiency and usefulness of Queen's University by adding to the endowment, providing for the establishment of new chairs, scholarships, and lectureships, and in every possible way enlisting and securing public sympathy and support.

To attain these ends it was resolved at meetings held at Kingston on the 28th, 29th and 30th April to form a Society, to be designated "Queen's University Endowment Association." The writer was named President, and a Committee was appointed to organize the Association and carry out its objects.

The members of the Committee have but one desire, to attain the objects of the Association in the best way and to the fullest extent. They, therefore, deem it wise and prudent to seek for the views generally of the friends of the University with respect to the organization of the Society.

At meetings of the Committee a draft of the Constitution and By-Laws has been prepared. A copy is transmitted for your examination, and any amendments you may suggest will receive respectful consideration.

The new Association will necessarily incur expenses for postage, printing, and possibly for a paid Secretary, while its main objects are to augment the revenue of the University and to enlist its friends in its welfare and in its defence. It is therefore proposed that each member shall pay an annual subscription. The Committee attach no little importance to the strength and influence of numbers, and therefore they consider it best, subject to the By-Laws, to let each individual fix the amount of his annual subscription. They anticipate that the annual subscription will generally range from one to ten dollars.

Subscriptions for Life Membership or donations for special objects will also be gratefully accepted.

It is suggested that the Association should not be confined to gentlemen, but that the influence of ladies should be sought, and that they should be admitted to membership. (See the proposed Constitution and By-Laws.)

A record of all annual and Life Subscriptions, Donations, and Bequests shall be kept and published with the Annual Report of the Association.

It has been proposed that there should be several Vice-Presidents, probably one for each City in the Dominion, and possibly for other places, who would preside at branch meetings and generally attend to the interests of the Association in his locality.

It is the desire of the Committee to consult the views of every friend of Queen's. They therefore earnestly invite you to examine the documents herewith sent to you.

It is intended that the Annual Reports of the University, the Calendar or "Extracts," Addresses and correspondence bearing on the objects of the Association and on the affairs of the University shall, from time to time, be sent to members of the Association.

Be good enough to return the draft Constitution with such improvements as may suggest themselves to you, or express your views in any other manner you may think proper.

You can materially promote the objects of the Association by securing the co-operation of old benefactors and enrolling new friends. Signatures on the enclosed form may be transmitted to the Honorary Secretary, Mr. R. V. Rogers, B.A., Kingston, Ont. The friends and benefactors of Queen's are so numerous that they can be reached only through the co-operation of representative men. I trust therefore that you will kindly and cordially assist in making our Association a success by waiting upon friends in your neighborhood and enlisting them in the cause.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

SANDFORD FLEMING,

*President.*

*Documents transmitted.*

1. Pamphlet containing report of the Chancellor on the scheme for confederating Universities and Colleges, and resolutions passed at meetings held during Convocation week at Kingston, April, 1885.

2. Draft of Constitution and By-Laws of "Queen's University Endowment Association."

3. Form intended for Annual and Life Members or Associate Members.



**Be good enough to examine the following attentively and give expression to your views if you consider that the Constitution or By-Laws may be advantageously changed in any respect.**

*(This Draft of a Constitution is modelled on the Constitution of the Association for the better endowment of the University of Edinburgh.)*

## CONSTITUTION

OF

# QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT ASSOCIATION.

1. The objects of the Association shall be:—To further in every possible way the interests and promote the general usefulness of Queen's College and University; and with this end in view, to circulate information respecting its condition, aims, purposes and prospects so as to enlist and secure general sympathy and support; to collect Funds by means of annual Subscriptions, Donations, and Bequests, and to appropriate them to the increase of the General University Endowment Fund, to the foundation of new Scholarships or Fellowships, to the augmentation, where necessary, of the Incomes of the Principal and Professors, to the establishment of new Professorships or Lectureships, and to any other purposes tending to promote the efficiency of the University as a seat of learning at Kingston.

2. Every annual Subscriber (under such By-Laws as may be adopted) shall be a Member of the Association.

3. Every donor of a sum not less than one hundred dollars shall be a life Member of the Association.

4. Every Lady subscribing annually (under such By-Laws as may be adopted) shall be an Associate Member with the same privileges as Members.

5. Every Lady presenting a donation of not less than one hundred dollars shall be an Associate life Member.

6. The Association shall have a President, Vice-Presidents, a General Committee, an Executive Committee, an Honorary Secretary, an Honorary Treasurer, and a paid Secretary.

7. Local Branches of the Association may be organized under such By-Laws as may be adopted by the General Committee. Each Branch may elect its own Chairman and Secretary-Treasurer.

8. The General Committee shall consist of the President, the Vice-Presidents, (who shall generally be Chairmen of Branch Associations), the Honorary Secretary, the Honorary Treasurer, and not less than Thirty other Members.

9. The President, the Vice-Presidents, the Honorary Secretary, the Honorary Treasurer, and the other Members of the General Committee, shall be elected annually at the Annual General Meeting, and shall be eligible for re-election.

10. The Executive Committee shall be nominated by the General Committee from among its own Members, and shall consist of the President, the Honorary Secretary, the Honorary Treasurer, and others, the number to be fixed by By-Law. The Executive Committee shall conduct the ordinary business of the Association.

ciation, and shall prepare the business to be submitted from time to time to the General Committee.

11. The General Committee shall have power to adopt By-Laws respecting the annual subscription of Members and Associate Members, the duties of officers of the Association, the formation of Local Branches, the number of Members to form the Executive Committee, the number to constitute a quorum of its own body, and of the Executive Committee, and respecting all other matters for the efficient carrying out of the objects of the Association not expressly provided for in the Constitution.

12. A General Meeting of the Association shall be held annually, during Convocation week at the end of April, and at such time and place as may be determined by the Executive Committee, for the purpose of receiving a Statement of the Accounts, and a Report of the proceedings of the preceding year, of deciding on any questions which may be submitted to it, and of electing Office-bearers for the ensuing year.

13. Meetings of the Association may also be called at any time by the General Committee or by the President on a requisition signed by not less than twenty Members of the Association.

14. The Annual Subscriptions and Life Subscriptions, as well as all those contributions to which no specific conditions are attached, shall, after meeting the necessary expenses of the Association, be applied to such purposes tending to promote the efficiency of the University as may be determined from time to time at any Meeting of the Association.

15. Any sum of money which the Donor shall entrust to the Association, for or towards any particular object shall, if the object be approved by the Executive Committee, and if the sum be sufficient to carry it into effect, be immediately applied to the fulfilment of that object.

16. No change in the Constitution of the Association shall be adopted except by a Resolution of an Annual Meeting proceeding on a Report of the General Committee.

R. V. ROGERS, B.A.,  
*Honorary Secretary.*

Kingston, July 1st, 1885.

---

## PROPOSED BY-LAWS.

1. The President, or in his absence one of the Vice-Presidents or a Chairman to be then chosen, shall preside at the meetings of the Association, and of the General and Executive Committees. The President shall be an *ex officio* member of all Committees and shall have the general supervision of the business and correspondence of the Association. In his absence one of the Vice-Presidents, to be named by him, shall perform the duties of the office.

2. The Honorary Secretary shall cause an accurate record to be kept of the proceedings of the Association, and of the General and Executive Committees, and shall cause to be issued all notices of meetings of these bodies. He shall also cause to be kept a record of annual subscriptions, donations, and bequests, and shall publish the same with the names of the donors, with the annual report of the Association.

3. The Honorary Treasurer shall have charge of the funds of the Association. All annual subscriptions, contributions, and other moneys shall be placed in his hands, and he shall be held accountable for them. By and with the advice of the Executive Committee he shall deposit all moneys in the name of the Asso-

ciation, and make such payments as they may direct under the authority of the General Committee. The annual report of the Honorary Treasurer shall be certified by at least two members of the Executive Committee and presented at the Annual Meeting.

4. At any meeting of the General Committee ten members shall constitute a quorum.

5. The Executive Committee shall consist of ten members, of whom the President, Honorary Secretary, and Honorary Treasurer shall be three; five shall form a quorum.

6. The annual subscriptions of Members and Associate Members shall range from one to ten dollars, payable at such time as may be determined by the Executive Committee.

7. Local Branch Associations may be organized where there are a sufficient number of Members and Associate Members residing. On a meeting being called at which ten or more Members are present, they may elect a Chairman, and Secretary-Treasurer, and proceed to deal with such matters as may tend to promote the objects of the Association.

8. At all the meetings of the Association the following order shall be observed in the transaction of business, unless set aside for the time being by a vote of the Members present. The same order, so far as applicable, shall be observed at the meetings of the General Committee, the Executive Committee, and the Local Branches.

1st. The Minutes of the previous meeting to be read, approved, and signed by the presiding officer and Secretary.

2nd. Communications to be announced and read if required.

3rd. Reports of Committees to be submitted.

4th. Unfinished business of previous meeting to be taken up.

5th. New business to be proceeded with.

6th. Proposal and election of members.

All decisions of the Chair on points of order shall be conclusive, unless reversed on appeal to the meeting.

Every motion shall be first stated by the presiding officer before debate or taking a vote. Every motion shall be reduced to writing.

9. Additions or amendments to the By-Laws shall be submitted in writing, proposed and seconded at a meeting of the General Committee; the same shall then be printed and sent to each member of the Committee with a notice that it shall be considered at the next regular meeting thereafter. Two thirds of all the votes cast shall be necessary for the adoption of the change proposed.

R. V. ROGERS,  
*Honorary Secretary.*

Kingston, July 1st, 1885.





Be good enough to return this form at your early convenience to the Honorary Secretary, R. V. Rogers, Esq., Kingston, with your own signature and the signature of others in your neighborhood who desire the prosperity of Queen's University.

To R. V. ROGERS, Esq.,

*Honorary Secretary, Kingston.*

Date, ..... 188

The undersigned approve of the objects of QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT ASSOCIATION, and desiring to give it a cordial support have to request you to enroll them as members of the Association and as subscribers for the amounts stated opposite their respective names.

SUBSCRIPTIONS OF MEMBERS OR ASSOCIATE MEMBERS.

(These subscriptions are expected to range from \$1 to \$10.)

Annual subscriptions (Dollars.)

Signatures.

P.O. Addresses.

SUBSCRIPTION OR DONATION OF LIFE MEMBER OR ASSOCIATE LIFE MEMBER.

(According to Articles 3 and 5 of the Draft Constitution this subscription is proposed to be \$100 or upwards.)

Amount (Dollars).

Signature.

P.O. Address.



# REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR

WITH REGARD TO THE SCHEME FOR

## CONFEDERATING UNIVERSITIES & COLLEGES.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE,  
KINGSTON, 28th April, 1885.

The scheme prepared under the auspices of the Minister of Education, for the consolidation of the Universities and Colleges of Ontario, came before the Trustees of Queen's at the last meeting of the Board. The Board gave it their earnest consideration, and their views, as expressed in a report dated 13th January last, were duly communicated to the Minister, and the Government of Ontario. While the Trustees gave expression to their own unanimous opinion, they felt that the question was of so momentous a character that it should not be disposed of hastily, and that it was right and proper that all the constituents of Queen's University throughout the Dominion should have an opportunity of expressing their views before final action was taken.

Accordingly it was deemed wise and prudent to withhold a final reply to the Minister of Education until the holding of this present Convocation. We have now consulted or otherwise learned the opinions generally of the graduates and benefactors of the University, and if the opinions so expressed be in harmony with the views of the Council and the meeting to-night, the Trustees will be in a position to take final action in the matter.

Soon after the scheme was made public, meetings of the friends of this University were held in various places in Kingston and the district around the city. The resolutions adopted at these meetings established that the City and County of Frontenac and the adjoining Counties, were a unit on the confederation question; that not a single person, as far as known, favoured the scheme, and that all held very strongly the opinion that Queen's should always remain at Kingston. These resolutions were communicated to the Government, and the better to convey the results of the meetings and impress upon the Government the feeling of the people, an influential deputation was appointed to wait upon the Minister of Education and his colleagues.

Those proceedings showed the strong views held by the citizens of Kingston and the County of Frontenac on the subject, but it was important to ascertain definitely the views of the friends of Queen's in other parts of the country. To effect this purpose it became my duty, with the sanction of the local committee, to send to them the following circular :

“QUEEN'S COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY,  
“KINGSTON, 2nd April, 1885.

“SIR,—At the last meeting of the Board of Trustees, a special Committee report was adopted, setting forth the views of the Board on the question of University Confederation. But as Queen's is supported by private beneficence, it was felt that all its constituents throughout the Dominion should be consulted before final action be taken. With that object in view, it was decided to obtain an expression of opinion from as many friends and supporters as possible before the meeting of Convocation, to be held on the 29th inst.

“You will find appended a copy of the report adopted by the Trustees (dated 13th January, 1885), together with a sheet containing three leading questions, to which your attention is earnestly directed.

“The friends and benefactors of Queen's throughout the Dominion are so numerous that it will be impossible for me to reach them all by circular letter. I trust, however, that you will have the goodness to wait upon those in your neighbourhood who are interested in the subject, and obtain an expression of their views and transmit the same to me in the enclosed envelope.

"Replies to the questions, with the names of individuals, may be entered on the enclosed sheet.

"I beg respectfully to request that you will give this matter your attention without delay.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"SANDFORD FLEMING, Chancellor."

That circular was sent to representative graduates and supporters of Queen's. They have responded to it very generally. No less than 355 replies have been received from friends of the University outside of the City of Kingston and the County of Frontenac, and these replies come from representative men of all classes and all shades of politics. I shall now say a word about the character of these replies, alluding first to that very important branch of the question, the financial one. The Trustees pointed out that the first step towards confederation could not be taken without money—that something like a quarter of a million of dollars would be required to move Queen's to Toronto and establish it there, as it is now established in Kingston. We put the whole matter squarely before our friends and supporters, and asked them if they would be prepared to assist in moving Queen's to Toronto. What is the reply? I do not refer to the citizens of Kingston, for it is perfectly well known that not a single person in or near Kingston would render the slightest aid, material or otherwise, to transfer Queen's. What then will our friends at a distance from Kingston do? Some say in effect, we will adhere to Queen's under any circumstances, but they add, "we sincerely hope she will remain at Kingston. Individually we are opposed to moving her to Toronto, but if the majority, and if the authorities should decide to make the change, we will continue to render what assistance we can. We would, however, greatly prefer contributing to the support of the University at Kingston." A very large percentage of all heard from state very emphatically that they will give nothing whatever, and many of them indicate that if Queen's College enters the Union they will withdraw the assistance they are now giving or have promised to give. There is a small minority in favour of the scheme, but two only of those state that they are prepared to put their hands in their pockets and give what they are able. As these two embrace all the resources we apparently can depend upon, should we accept the scheme, it may be well that I should read what they say. One says, "I would be willing to assist to the extent of my ability," the other says, "Yes, what I could; while thinking that on the whole, it is better for Queen's to unite, I do not think it would be better if she had to sacrifice her buildings and property in Kingston."

So much for the ways and means. The Trustees have made a general appeal and they have not received the promise of any sum whatever to meet the cost involved by the acceptance of the scheme submitted to them by the Minister of Education. They have looked to all the constituents of the University, but they have discovered no prospect whatever of raising a sufficient sum. On the contrary, many state that if the scheme be accepted they will cease to contribute any longer, and in consequence the sources of our present income will dry up.

It is therefore perfectly clear that if it be ever so desirable to transfer the University to Toronto? it is absolutely impossible to do so for want of means, and unless the Government undertakes to find about a quarter of a million of dollars and compensate for the shrinkage of income consequent on the change, Queen's *per force* must remain where she is now established.

Let us now see how the matter would stand if there was no money question. Let us assume that this difficulty was non-existent. In that event would it be wise to accept the invitation to enter the confederation, to give up our University powers, and move the whole establishment to Toronto. Would it be prudent or expedient to try the experiment which has been proposed? What do our graduates and benefactors living at a distance from Kingston say to this? I have before me a classification of the 355 replies received, and of these I find that three—and three only—are in favour of the scheme. I have referred to two of these replies, one from Pembroke, the other from Gananoque. The third is from Montreal. Unlike the first and second, the writer of the third reply tells us that he would be unable at present to render any assistance.



Ninety-nine per cent. of all heard from, from every quarter, and a hundred per cent. of all west of Kingston, are very decidedly opposed to Queen's accepting the scheme. We have replies from every Canadian city east of the Rocky Mountains; we have replies from nearly every town and village in Ontario, but not a single person west of Kingston whom we have heard from is in favour of Queen's going to Toronto. There is nothing ambiguous about the replies, and if we except the three I have mentioned, the vote may be said to be solid. All give their warmest support to the views expressed by the Trustees in their report of 13th January.

To give some idea of the wide field from which these responses come, and their representative character, I submit a list of the principal places heard from, excluding, for reasons already given, the City of Kingston and the County of Frontenac:

10	replies came from	Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.
27	"	Quebec, Montreal and Lachine.
12	"	Cornwall and Glengarry.
16	"	Brockville and neighbourhood.
19	"	Ottawa City.
37	"	the Ottawa Valley generally.
38	"	other places east of Kingston.
25	"	Belleville, Napanee and Trenton.
29	"	Cobourg, Peterborough, Lindsay, et.
22	"	Toronto.
14	"	Guelph, Galt, Fergus.
16	"	Hamilton and Dundas.
20	"	Huron and Bruce Counties.
15	"	London and neighbourhood.
16	"	Simcoe and Grey.
34	"	other places in Ontario.
6	"	Port Arthur and Manitoba.

---

Total, 355

---

Seldom has there ever been on any question, at any time, so much unanimity of opinion. We learn from these replies and from every other source of information, that not simply in Kingston and the neighbourhood, but throughout Ontario and in every section of the Dominion, the Graduates, the Benefactors, the friends of Queen's, are substantially of one mind as to the action which should now be taken. It requires no careful study of the returns which have been received to satisfy any one that the feeling is practically unanimous, that the invitation to enter the confederation of Universities and Colleges at Toronto should not be accepted. On the other hand, the strongest possible opinion prevails that Queen's University should for ever remain at Kingston, and that her friends should make every effort to strengthen her and extend her usefulness as one of the first schools of higher education in the Dominion.

I have in my address to-night, as representative of Queen's to the Tri-centenary of Edinburgh University, referred to a similar crisis in the history of the Scottish Universities, when an attempt was made to sweep away the four ancient seats of learning and on their ruins build a single "National" University. On that occasion much sympathy was evoked for the existing Universities, and it was proposed that Associations should be instituted to increase their endowments. It was felt that to be strong and useful a University must have a good income. I have mentioned the wonderful increase in the endowment of Edinburgh in the twenty years following the institution of the Association for that definite object. May not this be the proper time to initiate a similar proceeding in Canada? It seems to me that no period could be more appropriate, and that great good would result to our common country if we resolved to institute an Association for increasing the endowment of "Queen's University at Kingston."

SANDFORD FLEMING,  
Chancellor Queen's University.

## APPENDIX TO THE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

WITH RESPECT TO THE SCHEME FOR CONFEDERATING THE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES OF ONTARIO, DATED APRIL 28<sup>TH</sup>, 1885, BEING REPLIES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO REPRESENTATIVE GRADUATES AND SUPPORTERS OF QUEEN'S BEYOND THE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF KINGSTON AND THE COUNTY OF FRONTENAC.

### REPLIES

FROM NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK.

#### *To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?

#### *To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

#### *To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness?

#### *Answers to Questions*

#### I.

1. Fostheringham, Rev. T. F., St. John :  
No.

#### II.

Yes, if such a course was decided upon.

#### III.

Yes.

2. Forbes, J. G., St. John :  
No.

No, not one dollar, as I am against removal.

Yes, with all my heart.

3. Laing, Rev. Robt., Halifax :  
I am not.

I would not.

I do.

4. Macdonald (M.D.), Hugh N., Lake Ainslie :  
No.

Not to the amount of one cent.

Certainly, am ready to do all I can.

5. Pollok, Rev. Dr., Halifax :  
No.

No.

Yes.

6. Sinclair, Rev. A. McL., Springville :  
No.

No.

Yes.

7. Shore, Rev. Godfrey, St. John :  
No.

No.

Yes.

8. Sedgwick, Rev. Thos., Tatamagouche, N.S.:  
I am not.

No.

I do.

9. Smith, Rev. Thos. G., St. John :  
No.

No.

Yes.

10. Lawson, E., Halifax Hotel :  
No.

No.

Yes.

## FROM MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, ETC.

*To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?

*To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

*To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanent at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness.

*Answers to Questions*

I.	II.	III.
1. Allan, Andrew, Montreal : No.	No.	Yes.
2. Barclay, Rev. James, Montreal : No.	No.	Yes.
In answering the above questions I am giving the views, without exception, of all interested in Queen's with whom I have had opportunity to speak, and I have spoken to many.—J.B.		
3. Cook, Rev. Dr. John, Quebec : I am not.	Certainly not.	I do.
4. Cormack, Rev. James, Lachine, Q.: No.	No.	Yes.
5. Cruikshank, Rev. W. R., Montreal : Such a move is fraught with great perils to Queen's.	By no means.	Yes, and will, as I am able, aid her in her good work.
6. Dawes, T. A., Lachine, Q.: Not by any means.	I would not subscribe a cent.	I do.
7. Doudiet, Rev. Chas. A., Montreal : No.	No.	Yes.
8. Drummond, A. T., Montreal : No.	Not at present.	Yes.
9. Forsyth, R. O. W., Montreal : No.	Yes, very doubtful.	Yes.
10. Hague, Geo., Montreal : No.	No.	Yes.
11. Heine, Rev. G. Colborne, Montreal : No.	No.	Yes.
12. Hodgson, Jonathan, Montreal : Yes.	I could not at present.	No.
13. Hutchinson, M., Montreal : No.	No.	Yes.
14. Love, Rev. A. T., Quebec : No.	No.	Yes.
15. Mitchell, A., Montreal : No.	No.	Yes.
16. MacPherson, A., Montreal : No.	No.	Yes.
17. McCaul, Rev. James, Montreal : No.	No.	I do.

18. Oxley, Rev. M. S., Montreal :		
No.	No.	Yes.
19. Rankin, John, Montreal :		
No.	No.	Yes.
20. Riddell, A. F., Montreal :		
No.	Were it for the benefit of the University I might assist.	Yes.
21. Robertson, J. S., Lachine, Q.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
22. Rodgers (M.D.) T. A., Montreal :		
No.	No.	Yes.
23. Campbell, Rev. R., Montreal :		
No.	No.	Yes.
24. Jenkins, Rev. Dr. J., Montreal :		
No.	No.	Yes.
25. Muir, Rev. J. B., Huntingdon, Q.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
26. McLennan, E., Montreal :		
No.	No.	Yes.
27. Friend, Montreal :		
No.	No.	Yes.

FROM CORNWALL AND GLENGARRY.

<i>To Question No. 1.</i>	<i>To Question No. 2.</i>	<i>To Question No. 3.</i>
Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and Moving to Toronto?	As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?	Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness?

*Answers to Questions*

I.	II.	III.
1. Cameron, Rev. Hugh, Summerston : I am not.	Decidedly no.	I do.
2. Copeland, Jno., Cornwall :		
No.	No.	Yes.
3. Colquhoun, Wm., Cornwall :		
Decidedly not.	No.	Yes.
4. Colquhoun, G. C., Cornwall :		
No.	No.	Yes.
5. Dingwall, James, Cornwall :		
Most decidedly I am not.	No ; let Queen's remain in the old historical place on its old foundations. The tree is too old to be safely transplanted.	After a certain manner I do.

(1) Centralization in Toronto means preference for the combination of the Chinese and French systems—the uniformity of death.

(2) The retention of Queen's in its integrity at Kingston means the triumph of Scotch and Anglo-Saxon rivalry, variety, and rugged strength, and self-reliance—the variety of life.



(3) Canada and Ontario are too large for centralization of any kind—political or educational (higher) respectively.

6. Grant, A. J., Williamston :

I am not, certainly not.

By no means, without taking the expense into consideration.

I am strongly in favour of the University being permanently in Kingston.

7. McLennan, D. D., Williamston :

I think it would be a great injustice to those who subscribed liberally to the building and maintaining of so useful an institution as Queen's to be removed to Toronto.

8. MacLennan, D. B., Cornwall :

No.

No.

Yes.

9. Smith, A.M., James, Cornwall :—

No.

No.

Yes.

10 McLennan, J., (by the Lake) Lancaster :

I have cause to think that while union with the Provincial University may give strength to some other Colleges, and may be a desirable thing; Queen's, having a fair outfit and being fairly endowed, and having good elbow room in her location, may be very properly allowed to continue as she is.

11. Burnet, Rev. J. S., Martintown :

No.

No.

Yes.

12. McBean, A. G., Lancaster :

No.

No.

Yes.

#### FROM BROCKVILLE, ETC.

##### *To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?

##### *To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

##### *To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness?

#### *Answers to Questions*

I.

II.

III.

1. Bell, J. J., Brockville :

No.

No, because I do not think the removal desirable.

Yes.

2. Christie, Hon. W. J., Brockville :

No.

No.

Yes.

3. Edgar, W. H., Brockville :

No.

No.

Yes.

4. Hall, James, Brockville :

No.

No.

Yes.

5. Hutchison, Jas. A., Brockville :

No.

No.

Yes.

6. Mackenzie, Allen, Brockville :

No.

No.

Yes.

7. McIntyre, Wm., Brockville :

No.

No.

Yes.

8. McDonald, Judge H., Brockville :

No, decidedly not.

No, I would not.

I do.

- |                                      |               |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| 9. Mathison, Robt., Brockville :     | No.           | No.  | Yes.   |
| 10. Meikle, J. H., Morrisburgh :     | I am not.     | Having subscribed to the endowment of Queen's upon the distinct understanding that it was to be a University for Central Ontario, I would not. | I do not favour the scheme of removal, and I fully concur in the reasons given in Mr. Fleming's circular of this date. |
| 11. McMullen, Geo. A., Brockville :  | No.           | No.  | Yes.   |
| 12. Montgomery, Hugh, Morrisburgh :  | I am not.     | I would not.   | I do not   |
| 13. Smellie, W. B., Brockville :     | No.           | No.  | I do.  |
| 14. Webster, Geo. R., Brockville :   | No.           | No.  | No.  |
| 15. Elliot, J. Arthur, Brockville :  | No ; no ; no. | No.  | I do.  |
| 16. Moore (M.D.) V. H., Brockville : | No.           | No.  | Yes.   |

---

FROM OTTAWA CITY.

*To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving in Toronto?

*To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

*To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness?

*Answers to Questions*

- | I.                                       | II.         | III. |
|--|-------------|------|
| 1. Bell, (M.D., LL.D.), Robert, Ottawa : | No.         | Yes. |
| 2. Booth, J. R. :                        | No.         | Yes. |
| 3. Corbett, (M.D.), Thomas :             | No.         | Yes. |
| 4. Chrysler, F. H. :                     | No.         | Yes. |
| 5. Farries, Rev. F. W. :                 | No.         | Yes. |
| 6. Fraser, George L.B. :                 | No.         | Yes. |
| Decidedly not.                           |             |      |
| 7. Gilmour, Allan, senr. :               | Not a cent. | Yes. |
| No, most decidedly, no.                  |             |      |
| 8. Hamilton, William :                   | No.         | Yes. |
| No.                                      |             |      |
| 9. Hopkirk, H. G. :                      | No.         | Yes. |
| No.                                      |             |      |

- |  |                         |     |                    |
|--|-------------------------|-----|--------------------|
| 10. Mark, (M.D.), Robert :                                     | No.                     | No. | Yes.               |
| It is in my heart to help Queen's, as I prosper in the future. |                         |     |                    |
| 11. Moore, Rev. Dr. William :                                  | No.                     | No. | Yes.               |
| No. Strongly opposed to such action.                           |                         |     |                    |
| 12. McCracken, John J. :                                       | No.                     | No. | Yes.               |
| 13. Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A. :                        | No.                     | No. | Yes.               |
| 14. Stewart, McLeod :  | No, most decidedly not. | No. | Yes.               |
| 15. McRae, J. W. :   | Decidedly not,          | No. | I heartily concur. |
| 16. McTavish, D. B. :  | No.                     | No. | Yes.               |
| 17. Schultz, Hon. John. :                                      | No.                     | No. | Yes.               |
| 18. Wood, John F. :  | No.                     | No. | Yes.               |
| 19. Platt, (M.P.), J. M. :                                     |                         |     |                    |

"That system of higher education is best which is placed within the reach of the many instead of the few. The interests of Toronto and the interests of Ontario are not identical in all respects. Whenever an attempt at centralization threatens the general interests of the people, it is our plain duty to resist it by all constitutional means within our reach."

#### FROM THE OTTAWA VALLEY.

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <i>To Question No. 1.</i>   | <i>To Question No. 2.</i>   | <i>To Question No. 3.</i>  |
| Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto? | As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work? | Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness. |

#### Answers to Questions

- |   |                |   |
|---|----------------|---|
| I.  | II.            | III.  |
| 1. Armour, John, Allan's Mills :<br>In favour of remaining in Kingston. | No.            | I favour the views of the trustees that it remain in Kingston.  |
| 2. Burnet, A., Renfrew :<br>No.   | No.            | Yes.  |
| 3. Bell, R., Carleton Place :<br>No, decidedly no.                      | No.            | Yes.  |
| 4. Bennett, Rev. Dr John, Almonte :<br>No.                              | Certainly not. | Most certainly ; to do otherwise would be a breach of faith with the Benefactors of the University, and Educationally an irreparable loss to Eastern Ontario. |

5. Campbell, J. G., Perth :		
No.	No.	I do.
6. Cameron, E., Perth :		
No.	No.	Yes.
7. Clark, J. M. U., Smith's Falls :		
No.	No.	Yes.
8. Clark, A., Smith's Falls :		
No.	No.	Yes.
9. Crombie, Rev. John, Smith's Falls :		
No.	No.	Yes.
10. Ferguson, H. M., Carleton Place :		
No.	No.	Yes.
11. Gandier, Rev. J., Fort Coulonge :		
No.	No.	Yes.
12. Gillies, John, Carleton Place :		
No.	No.	Yes.
13. Gillies, James, Carleton Place :		
No.	No.	Yes.
14. Johnston, J. R., Carleton Place :		
I heartily agree with the report adopted by the trustees, and in answer to the question would emphatically say <i>no</i> .	I would not.	I decidedly favour the views adopted.
15. Kellock, (M.D.), J. D., Perth :		
No, most decidedly.	Not one cent.	Yes.
16. Lavell, John R., Smith's Falls :		
No.	No.	Yes.
17. Lafferty, (M.D.), W. A., Perth :		
No.	No.	Yes.
18. Mallock, E. G., Perth :		
No.	No.	Yes.
19. MacGillivray, Rev. M., Perth :		
No. Not at all, according to the proposed scheme.	No. But I am ready to assist in making her more efficient where she is. What she is doing shows she deserves this.	I certainly do.
20. Macalister, Rev. J. M., Ashton :		
No.	No.	Yes.
21. McDonald, Rev. D., Carleton Place :		
No, never.	No, not even to the extent of one cent.	Yes, and I hope a successful effort may soon be made in that direction.
22. McEwen, F., Carleton Place :		
No.	No.	Yes.
23. McKenzie, (M.D.), Edward, Smith's Falls :		
No.	No.	Yes.



24. McGregor, P.C., Almonte :

No, a thousand times no !

No, I believe the whole scheme of confederation to be the result of the extravagance of Toronto University and jealousy of Queen's. I am opposed to Confederation in either religion, politics, or educational affairs. My pride revolts against being swallowed up by the big sister in Toronto.

No.

I shall always be happy to subscribe as far as my means will permit to "build up Queen's," but never to "destroy" her.

Yes, emphatically yes.

Yes : I think the Board of Trustees have taken the only rational view of the situation that could be taken under the circumstances.

25. Mylne, Rev. Solomon, Smith's Falls :

No.

No.

Yes. It would be a great injustice to Eastern Ontario to remove Queen's to Toronto.

26. McKillop, Rev. Chas., Admaston :

No.

No.

Yes.

Indeed I am not. It would be detrimental to the best interest of the church to which I belong. It would be retrocession from the action of the supporters of Queen's in the past. It would be a long step in the direction of extreme centralization in educational bureaucracy in which I never believed. It seems to me that Queen's is needed for the public benefit in the education of the eastern part of this province.

I do. I hope that the people of Ontario will not be so unjust as to demand that this grand old institution so deeply rooted in the history of our country should be pulled up from its foundations.

27. Proudfoot, Alex., Fort Coulonge :

No.

No.

Yes.

28. Preston, (M.D.), R. F., Carleton Place :

No.

No.

Yes.

29. Ross, Rev. James, Perth :

No.

No.

Yes.

30. Rothwell, Wm., Perth :

While we are prepared to consider a just scheme of University confederation we cannot agree to see Queen's transferred from Eastern Ontario. Higher education in Eastern Ontario requires her presence in Kingston.

No ; money can be better spent in further equipping her.

Yes, certainly.

As a body of Alumni of Queen's we have had a meeting and expressed our opinions, which accorded with the answers given above.

WM. ROTHWELL.

31. Stewart, Daniel W., Renfrew :  
No.

No.

Yes.

32. Struthers, P., Carleton Place :  
No.

No.

Yes.

33. Yuill, Joseph, Carleton Place :  
No.

No.

Yes.

34. Smallfield, A., Renfrew :

I should regret to see the importance of Queen's University to Eastern Ontario ignored, or its claims to the fullest consideration set aside.

35. Fraser, Rev. J. F., The Parsonage, Metcalfe :  
No.

No.

Yes.

"I feel very strongly that the proposed removal of Queen's to Toronto would be wrong in itself, suicidal to Queen's, and on the whole, detrimental to the interests of education."

36. Irving, A., Pembroke :

Yes; if the other colleges enter the confederation, Queen's would not be able to compete with the new university.

I would be willing to assist to the extent of my ability.

I would like the confederation scheme better if Queen's, as a teaching institution, could be retained at Kingston.

37. MacNab, F. F., Arnprior :

Would favour confederation, but only on condition that the University be allowed to remain at Kingston.

Certainly not; for I hold that Eastern Ontario is entitled to University facilities at Kingston, and further, that centralization of the kind proposed would not be in the interest of higher education.

I do. The report is an admirable one, and at once commends itself to the judgment.

#### FROM THE EAST GENERALLY.

##### *To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?

##### *To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

##### *To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness?

#### *Answers to Questions*

##### I.

1. Anderson (M.D.), W. J., Winchester Springs :  
I am not, and will oppose it to the end.

##### II.

I would not.

##### III.

I do, and will use any influence I can in that way.

2. Andrews, Rev. Joseph, Middleville :

No; I think it decidedly wrong, and am glad to see the spirit-d stand that the friends of Queen's have taken.

No; but would do all in my power to aid Queen's if she remains at Kingston.

I do.

3. Bryce, W. S., Gananoque :  
No.

No.

Yes.

4. Beatty, Wm., Lansdowne :		
No.	No.	Yes.
5. Bradley, J. A., Lansdowne :		
No.	No.	Yes.
6. Bradley, Henry, Lansdowne :		
No.	No.	Yes.
7. Bell, Andrew, Carillon, Q.:		
I am not.	No; any little that I can give will only be given if the University remains in Kingston.	I do.
8. Cameron, Colin, Iroquois :		
No.	No.	Yes.
9. Colquhoun, Dr. Geo., Iroquois :		
No.	No.	Yes.
10. Cornell M.D., Seth Shaw, late Med. Council, Ont.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
11. Chambers, Rev Thos. S., Wolfe Island :		
No.	No.	Yes.
12. Davies (M.D.), R. A., Easton's Corners:		
No.	No.	Yes.
13. Darling, Thos., Lansdowne :		
No.	No.	Yes.
14. Forlong, Rev. Wm., Lachute, Q.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
15. Gallagher, J. T., Newboro':		
No.	No.	Yes.
16. Gallaher, Rev. John, Pittserry :		
Certainly, not ; it would mean disaster ; perhaps death.	No, no.	The views of the Board of Trustees have my hearty concurrence.
17. Glassford, Rev. T. S., Richmond West :		
No.	Never.	Yes.
18. Gillies, George, Gananoque :		
No.	No.	Yes.
19. Herbison, James, Gananoque :		
No.	No.	Yes.
20. Kellock, Rev. David, Spencerville :		
No.	No.	Yes.
21. Lewis, L. S., Newboro':		
No.	No.	Yes.
22. Lang, Rev. W. A., Lunenburg, Ont.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
23. Mathew, W., Gananoque :		
No.	No.	Yes.
24. Mitchell, Geo., Gananoque :		
No.	No.	Yes.
25. McCormack, James, Lansdowne :		
No.	No.	Yes.

- |  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| 26. McNeil, Walter, Lansdowne :          | No.   | No.  | Yes.  |
| 27. McColl, Rev. E. C. W., Middleville : | Most emphatically not.  | As ready as I would be to go to sea in a basket.                   | I do; the public is more likely to have good bread and full weight if there are several bakeries.               |
| 28. McArthur, Rev. G., Newington :       | I am not in favour of any such proposal. Far from it.   | No; but on the contrary, I would withdraw my present subscription. | My views are expressed in the report. I am prepared to renew my subscription, when the time comes for doing so. |
| 29. Preston (M.D.), R. H., Newboro' :    | No.   | No.  | Yes.  |
| 30. Porteous, Rev. George, Toledo :      | No.   | No.  | Yes.  |
| 31. Robertson, James, Madrid, N. Y. :    | No. Confederation defeats the object of education.  | No. It would be a waste of time and money.                         | Yes; most decidedly.  |
| 32. Rodgers, Samuel, Gananoque :         | No.   | No.  | Yes.  |
| 33. Rodgers, D. H., Gananoque :          | No.   | No.  | Yes.  |
| 34. Taylor, Jos., Lansdowne :            | No.   | No.  | Yes.  |
| 35. Tett, B., Bedford Mills :            | No.   | No.  | Yes.  |
| 36. Tett, J. P., Bedford Mills :         | No.   | No.  | Yes.  |
| 37. Gracey, Rev. H., Gananoque :         | <p>If confederation takes place it will be bad for Queen's in any case. If she unites, it will cost her a lot of money. If she does not unite it will be hard with her present endowment to compete with such an institution, and keep the reputation of her degrees on a par with those of the Central University. Looking at the difficulties, the less will be found with confederation, and Queen's should go into it, if any provision is made for taking her buildings at a valuation.</p> <p>Yes, what I could. While thinking that on the whole it is better for Queen's to unite, I do not think it would be better if she had to sacrifice her buildings and property in Kingston.</p> <p>It would certainly be a great advantage to Kingston and Central Canada, to have Queen's remain, and if she does remain while the others unite at Toronto, her friends must come to her aid. I think it will cost more to put Queen's on a financial basis that will enable her to cope with the new institution than it would cost to carry her to Toronto, and make her the leading college in the confederated institution.</p> |  |   |
| 38. Cochran, Alex., Lansdowne :          | No.   | No.  | Yes.  |



## FROM BELLEVILLE, ETC.

*To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?

*To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

*To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness?

*Answers to Questions*

I.	II.	III.
1. Burrows, Fred., Napanee : No.	No.	Yes.
2. Brown, A., Belleville : No.	No.	Yes.
3. Bell, John, Belleville : No.	No.	Yes.
4. Coulter, (M.D.), H. M., Sharbot Lake : No.	No.	Yes.
5. Carscadin, T. G., Napanee : No.	No.	Yes.
6. Day, (M.D.), Walter D. P. W. : No.	No.	Yes.
7. Day, (M.D.), L. E., Harwood : No.	No.	Yes.
8. Deans, George, Trenton : No.	No.	Yes.
9. Davis, B. W., Trenton : Most emphatically no.	No.	I do.
10. Ferguson, W. B., Napanee : No.	No.	Yes.
11. Ferguson, J. F., Napanee : No.	No.	Yes.
12. Fraleck, Judge E. B., Belleville : No.	Yes, as far as I am able.	Yes.
13. Gibson, (M.D.), W. I., Belleville : Most emphatically no.	No.	In every sense of the word, yes.
14. Huffman, James C., Napanee : No.	No.	Yes.
15. Hueye, Alex., Napanee : No.	No.	Yes.
16. James, Charles, Napanee : No.	No.	Yes.
17. MacClean, Rev. M. W., Belleville : No.	As far as in my power.	Yes.
18. Robertson (M.P.), Alex., Belleville : No.	No.	Yes.
19. Thomas, J. Parker, Belleville : No.	No.	Yes.

20. Forin, A., (M.D.), Belleville :		
No.	No.	Yes.
21. Thinet, Samuel :		
No.	No.	Yes.
22. Stewart, junior, S.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
23. Ward, (M.D.), Geo. C. T., Napanee :		
No.	No.	Yes.
24. Macnee, P. C., Picton :		
No.	No.	Yes.
25. Rathbun, E. W., Deseronto :		

"I have always been an advocate of the American system of aiding colleges, *i. e.*, by private effort. Queen's must remain where she is."

### COBOURG, PORT HOPE, PETERBORO', LINDSAY, ETC.

<i>To Question No. 1.</i>	<i>To Question No. 2.</i>	<i>To Question No. 3.</i>
Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?	As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?	Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness?

#### *Answers to Questions*

I.	II.	III.
1. Bell, Rev. Alexander, Peterboro' :		
No.	No.	Yes.
2. Carmichael, Rev. James, Norwood :		
I am of opinion that both for the purpose of conserving the true interest of Queen's and higher education an emphatic <i>no</i> should be given to the foregoing question.	No.	I must say that I heartily endorse the views expressed by the Board of Trustees in the report referred to, and give a hearty <i>Amen</i> to the last clause of the question.
3. Cameron, Rev. John J., Pickering :		
No.	No.	Yes.
4. Craig (M.D.) H. A., Cobourg :		
No.	No.	Yes.
5. Currie, Rev. Archibald, Sonya :		
No ; by no means.	No.	Yes, in every respect.
All parties whom I am acquainted with, answer as I have done.		
6. Dow, John Ball :		
No ; emphatically no.	No.	Yes.
7. Dennistoun, Jas. F., Peterboro' :		
No.	No.	Yes.
8. Dennistoun, Robt., Peterboro' :		
No.	No.	Yes.
9. Dunlop, A. C., Peterboro' :		
No.	No.	Yes.
10. Dow, Thomas, Whitby :		
No.	No.	Yes.

- |                                     |  |   |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 11. Dinwoodie, R., Campbellford :   | No.  | No.   | Yes.   |
| 12. Davis, Robert, York :           | No.  | No.   | Yes.   |
| 13. Gray (Rev. Dr.) John, Orillia : | No; I favour at least three Universities for Ontario—Queen's for Eastern, Toronto for Central, and London for Western. | No; such centralization I consider advantageous to denominational Colleges in and around Toronto, but prejudicial to Queen's and to the cause of higher education in Ontario. | Yes; these views were adopted on grounds independent of the report of the Board of Trustees, and before the tenor of the report was known. |
- (1) That the mode of instruction adopted at Queen's is better fitted for a new country like Ontario than that of University College.
- (2) That if any grant from Provincial funds be made to Toronto University a proportionate sum be also given to Queen's.
- (3) That the matter must be considered not in the interests of Toronto simply, but in those of the whole Province.
- |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| 14. Herriman, W. L., Port Hope :       | No.  | No.   | Yes.   |
| 15. Jones, Henry M., Marmora :         | No.  | No.   | Yes.   |
| 16. Hamilton, Hon. Robt., Peterboro' : | No.  | No.   | Yes.   |
| 17. Miller, Robt., Pickering :         | No.  | No.   | Yes.   |
| 18. McKay, Angus, Pickering :          | No.  | No.   | Yes.   |
| 19. McCrae, Rev. D. L., Cobourg :      | No; the more the scheme is discussed the more strongly do the friends of Queen's in this district oppose it. | No; we would give any help we can, if it remains in Kingston. | Yes; every friend of Queen's in this locality feels that such is for the best interest of University education in Ontario. |
- |  |                                |  |   |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 20. McDonald, (M.D.) A. R., Brighton : | No.                            | No.  | Yes.  |
| 21. McColl, E. C., Cobourg :           | No.                            | No.  | Yes.  |
| 22. McLennan, John, Lindsay :          | No.                            | No.  | Yes.  |
| 23. McTavish, Rev. Dr., Lindsay :      | Decidedly and emphatically no. | Why should I? Queen's, as I look upon her now, would be no longer in existence. Certainly not. | I do; the removal of Queen's from Kingston would be a backward step in the history of higher education in Canada. |
- |                          |  |   |      |
|--------------------------|--|---|------|
| 24. Tuttle, L., Tweed :  | No.  | No.   | Yes. |
| 25. Wood, S. F., Madoc : | No; I believe that higher education would not be forwarded by taking Queen's to Toronto. | No; to my mind, Queen's has a work of her own that can only be successfully prosecuted by retaining its identity as a University. | Yes. |

## 26. Williamson, W., Port Hope :

The question of removal depends on its practicability. If practicable, it would be in the interest of a higher educational standard.

I am of opinion that in case of transfer the expense ought to be borne by the Ontario Government.

Should there be a confederation of Colleges and Queen's decline entering, she would require a large increase of endowment to enable her to maintain a first-class position. If she should be unable to do this, her influence would be limited, and the best class of students would study in Toronto.

## 27. Cleland, James, Port Hope :

The same reply as No. 26.

## 28. Linton, A. R., Oroño :

No.

No.

Yes.

## 29. Wishart, Rev. D., Madoc :

No.

No.

Yes.

---

FROM TORONTO.

---

*To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?

*To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

*To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness.

*Answers to Questions*

## I.

## 1. Clark, J. A., Toronto :

I think that Queen's College should remain in Kingston and not enter into confederation, giving up the powers she has at present, and as she has done and is now doing excellent progress in Ontario, she should be allowed to go on as she has hitherto done.

## II.

We think it imprudent to incur any expenditure to transfer the University to this city; besides, the country is not in a very prosperous way at present.

## III.

We think the views of the Board of Trustees, in their report Jan. 13th, '85, are correct, and that the University should remain permanently in Kingston, and should be encouraged and built up there. We, as natives of Scotland, always heard that the Universities in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen had done a great deal of good for the rich and poor in our country, and Queen's will no doubt do likewise.

## 2. Cleland, Rev. Wm., Toronto :

Very decidedly not.

I would not.

I do.

## 3. Dickson, Geo. P.:

No.

No.

Yes.

## 4. Geikie (M.D.), Walter B.:



I think it would be the height of unwisdom to do so.

Certainly not ; I would like to see Queen's live and prosper, not die and be lost sight of.

My views very heartily accord with those of the Board, and I further think that by extending affiliation to teaching bodies of high standing, such as Trinity Medical School, Toronto, Queen's College influence might be widely extended.

5. Gilmour, Isaac :		
No.	No.	Yes.
6. Hay (M.P.), Robert, Toronto :		
No.	Not by any means.	Yes.
7. Henderson, W.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
8. Jardine, Alex., Toronto :		
No.	No.	Yes.
9. Kay, John :		
No.	No.	Yes.
10. Maclellan, James :		
No.	No.	Yes.
11. Macdonald, Geo.:		
No.	No.	Yes ; to which end will be glad to do all in my power.
12. Maclellan, P. J. :		
No.	No.	Yes.
13. McGee, David:		
No.	No.	Yes.
14. Mitchell, Wm.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
15. Michie, Geo.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
16. Milligan, Rev. G. M.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
17. O'Reilly, Jas. R., Toronto :		
Decidedly not.	No.	Yes.
18. Perry, Charles :		
No.	No.	Yes.
19. Rolls, James :		
No.	No.	Yes ; I think the country will be better served by several independent institutions distributed over the country than by one institution centrally located.
20. Strachan, James :		
No.	No.	Yes.
21. Macdonnell, Rev. D. J.:		
No.	No.	Yes.
22. Tanner, Rev. Charles, Bendale :		
No.	No.	Yes.

N.B.—Rev. Mr. Tanner forwarded a long list of answers from Scarboro' to the same effect as his own, but they came too late for publication.

## FROM GUELPH, GALT, ETC.

*To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?

*To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

*To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness?

*Answers to Questions*

I.	II.	III.
1. Bell, William, Guelph : No.	No.	Yes.
2. Davidson, Charles, Guelph : No, certainly not.	No, not for such a purpose.	Yes, I do.
3. Davidson, John, Guelph : No.	No.	Yes.
4. Ferrier, A. D., Fergus : No.	No.	Yes.
5. Gowen, John, Guelph : Quite opposed to leaving Kingston.	No.	Favour the views of the Board.
6. Kennedy, (M.D.), W. B., Guelph : No.	No.	Yes.
7. Lumsden, John M., Galt : No; several well-endowed universities differing in the system of education and located at reasonable distances from each other has proved in Scotland, Eng'and, the United States and other countries a successful system, and the contemplated change would tend to lessen the number of university students, prevent many well-wishers of university education giving donations, and wound the feelings of those who have their preference for some existing university; and further, instead of leaving well alone the issue of said change, at least, is untested and exceedingly doubtful.	No. If Queen's University is left at Kingston I would assist, but not otherwise.	Yes.
8. Middlemiss, Rev. James, Elora : No.	No	Yes I do, very decidedly.
9. Strachan, Rev. Donald, Rockwood : No.	No.	Yes.
10. Smith, Rev. James C., Guelph : No.	No.	Yes.

- |  |  |      |
|--|--|------|
| 11. Torrance, Rev. Dr. Robert, Guelph :  |  |      |
| No, she should not, in my opinion, hold her powers in abeyance, even for a limited time.   | No, most decidedly ; nor do I think any public fund should be applied to this purpose. | Yes. |
| 12. Wardrope, Rev. Dr. Thomas, Guelph :  |  |      |
| I consider it essential to the existence of Queen's that she should remain at Kingston. In the event of removal to Toronto I should regard the charter as practically valueless. | No.  | Yes. |
| 13. Wilson, James, Galt :  |  |      |
| No.  | No.  | Yes. |
| 14. Williams, Samuel, Fergus :   |  |      |
| No.  | No.  | Yes. |

---

FROM HAMILTON, DUNDAS, ETC.

---

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <i>To Question No. 1.</i><br>Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto ? | <i>To Question No. 2.</i><br>As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work ? | <i>To Question No. 3.</i><br>Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness. |
|---|---|---|

*Answers to Questions*

- |                                     |               |      |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|------|
| I.                                  | II.           | III. |
| 1. Bruce, John A., Hamilton :       |               |      |
| No.                                 | No.           | Yes. |
| 2. Bertram, (M.D.), S. A., Dundas : |               |      |
| No.                                 | No.           | Yes. |
| 3. Bissone te, J. D., Dundas :      |               |      |
| No, I am not.                       | No, never.    | Yes. |
| 4. Connell, J. C., Dundas :         |               |      |
| No.                                 | No.           | Yes. |
| 5. Fitzgerald, L. S., Dundas :      |               |      |
| No.                                 | Possibly not. | Yes. |
| 6. Glasgow, John, Hamilton :        |               |      |
| No.                                 | No.           | Yes. |
| 7. Leggat, M., Hamilton :           |               |      |
| No.                                 | No.           | Yes. |
| 8. McCulloch, A., Thorold :         |               |      |
| No.                                 | No.           | Yes. |
| 9. Malloch, Dr. A. E., Hamilton :   |               |      |
| No.                                 | No.           |      |

Yes. The country would never have heard of the scheme if the University of Toronto had not been in need of funds.

10. Miller, Thomas, Hamilton :		
No.	According to answer to first question I must reply to this in the negative.	Yes.
11. Simpson, James, Hamilton :		
No.	No.	Yes.
12. Smith, J. Findley, Dundas :		
No.	No.	Yes.
13. Stewart, James, Hamilton :		
No.	No.	Certainly.
14. Walker, James, Hamilton :		
No.	No.	Yes.
15. Walker, (M.D.), A. H., Dundas :		
No.	No.	Yes.
16. Laidlaw, Rev. R. J., Hamilton :		
No.	No.	Yes.

---

FROM HURON AND BRUCE.

---

*To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?

*To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

*To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness?

*Answers to Questions*

I.	II.	III.
1. Bain, D. James, Paisley :		
No.	No.	Decidedly yes.
2. Bethune (M.D.) Alexander, Wingham :		
No.	No.	Yes.
3. Cameron (M.P.), M. C., Goderich :		
No.	No.	Yes.
4. Clapp, (B.A.), David, Harristown :		
No, I am not.	I think not.	I am.
5. Campbell, Rev. John, Harriston :		
No.	I would, should Queen's agree to enter the "Federation," but I am unfavourable to her entering it.	I do.
6. Douglas (M.D.), Robert, Port Elgin :		
No.	No.	Yes.
7. Ferguson, Rev. Jno., Chesley :		
No.	Possibly I would, if the transference were decided by the friends of Queen's to be in her interest and in that of higher education.	Yes.
8. Hay, Wm., Paisley :		
No.	I could not.	Yes.



9. Moore, Rev. John, Allenford :		
No.	No.	Yes.
10. Malloch, G. W., Paisley :		
No.	No.	Yes.
11. Niven, Rev. D. P., Dromore :		
No emphatically.	No.	Yes.
12. McDonald, Rev. Alex., Duntroon :		
No.	No.	I do.
13. McFhie, G. S., Elgin, South Crosby :		
Queen's remain as she is.	By no means ; like giving up your birthright.	Yes, <i>in toto</i> .
14. Mordy, Rev. John, Mildmay :		
No.	No.	Yes.
15. Strachan, D. C., Goderich :		
No.	No.	Yes.
16. Steele, J., Paisley :		
No!!	No!!	Yes.
17. Ure, Rev. Dr. Robert, Goderich :		
Not in favour of Queen's entering proposed federation on terms proposed.	No.	I do.
18. Williamson, A. M., Kincardine :		
No.	No.	Yes.
19. Young, Rev. S., Clifford :		
No.	No.	Yes.
20. Young (M.D.) W. James :		
No.	No.	Yes.

---

FROM STRATFORD, LONDON, ETC.

---

<i>To Question No. 1.</i>	<i>To Question No. 2.</i>	<i>To Question No. 3.</i>
Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?	As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?	Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness.

*Answers to Questions*

I.	II.	III.
1. Barton, D., Stratford :		
No.	No.	Yes.
2. Barton, James, Stratford :		
No.	No.	Yes.
3. Briden, Wm., Ingersoll :		
No.	No.	Yes.

- |                                  |     |       |
|----------------------------------|-----|-------|
| 4. Crerar, James, Shakespeare :  |     |       |
| No.                              | No. | Yes.  |
| 5. Hamilton, John, Port Rowan :  |     |       |
| No.                              | No. | I do. |
| 6. Jarvis, Chas. E., London :    |     |       |
| No.                              | No. | Yes.  |
| 7. McEwen, Rev. J., London :     |     |       |
| No.                              | No. | Yes.  |
| 8. Osborne, Jas. K., Brantford : |     |       |
| No.                              | No. | Yes.  |

9. Proudfoot, Rev. Dr. John J. A., London :

Queen's might enter the proposed confederation without "moving to Toronto." University degrees need not be given up, but merely held in abeyance temporarily.

No ; it would be sad waste of money. In fact it could not be done at present.

Yes ; it would be wrong to remove the College from Kingston in view of what Kingston has done for it ; besides, a College is needed in Central Canada. Queen's has a splendid place of usefulness. Absolute centralization is in itself not desirable. It has been forced on the Minister of Education, and it will now lead to a reaction. Considering the slender connection which exists between at least the Arts department in Queen's and the Presbyterian Church really some arrangement might be made by which Queen's might receive Government support. Of course we could not ask Government to maintain the Theological department. That must be sustained by the Church, and it could be without much extra effort.

- |  |     |      |
|--|-----|------|
| 10. Scholz, John J., Stratford :       |     |      |
| No.                                    | No. | Yes. |
| 11. Ireland, Geo. E., Chatham :        |     |      |
| No.                                    | No. | Yes. |
| 12. Wightman, John, Chatham Centre :   |     |      |
| No.                                    | No. | Yes. |
| 13. Robertson, Wm., Chatham Centre :   |     |      |
| No.                                    | No. | Yes. |
| 14. Tallach, Rev. T., Chatham Centre : |     |      |
| No.                                    | No. | Yes. |

15. McDowell, Jas. A., Sarnia :

Alumni and benefactors would probably discontinue support to Queen's if removed.

## SIMCOE AND GREY.

*To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?

*To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

*To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness.

*Answers to Questions*

## I.

## II.

## III.

1. Bethune, (M.D.), Henry F., Clanbrassil :

Decidedly not.

I would not.

I do.

2. Crozier, John, Orangeville :

No.

No, not a cent.

Yes.

3. Campbell, G. A., Orangeville :

No.

No, not a cent.

I do.

4. Campbell, Neil, Nottawa :

No.

No.

Yes.

5. Chisholm, Rev. John, McIntyre :

I am bitterly opposed to it.

At present I am giving \$20 per annum, but if it is moved to Toronto I would give nothing.

I am in hearty sympathy with their views, and shall increase my contributions and efforts in other respects to build up and extend its usefulness.

6. Cornell, (M.D.), A. P., Gravenhurst :

No.

Not one cent.

Keep Queen's at Kingston at all hazards.

7. Dawson, Rev. A., Gravenhurst :

No.

No.

Yes, with all my heart.

8. Fraser, Rev. Dr. Wm., Barrie :

It may be a grand idea to unite all the Universities into one great University of Ontario, but the utility of such confederation is open to grave question ; centralization is not always an un-mixed good.

No ; except if it were imperative, being my share of several public burdens.

I have nothing to say in opposition to the arguments of the Trustees, though it may easily be foreseen that if confederation is accomplished, leaving out Queen's, it may work much to her disadvantage.

9. McKay, Rev. W. E., Orangeville :

Certainly not.

No, not a cent.

I do. Instead of pulling it down it should be built up and rendered more efficient.

10. Reed, Hugh E., Orangeville :

Same as above.

11. Stewart, F. C., Orangeville :

Same as above.

12. McKee, Wm., Cookstown :

No.

No.

Yes.

13. Patterson, Rev. G. C., Beaverton :  
 No. I would not. Yes.
14. Irwin, Francis, Orangeville :  
 No. No. Yes.
15. Scott, Rev. A. H., Owen Sound :  
 The more I think about the proposed change the less favourably do I regard it. Let her stay where she is, and improve. No. Yes; then let her remain. Were it not for Queen's in Eastern Ontario, as far as I can judge, I would never have been a student in a University. For the good work she is doing to all who come to her halls, and especially for young men in Eastern Ontario, touch not her standing.
16. Moodie, Rev. Robt., Stayner :  
 No; it would be sad to extinguish the light of learning in Central Ontario. Let the open doors of the College in Kingston be an attraction to the young men of the district. Yes.

---

### ONTARIO, GENERALLY.

---

- | <i>To Question No. 1.</i>   | <i>To Question No. 2.</i>   | <i>To Question No. 3.</i>  |
|---|---|--|
| Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto? | As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work? | Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness? |
| <i>Answers to Questions</i>   |   |  |
| I.  | II.   | III.   |
| 1. Abbott, R. H., Comber :<br>No.   | No.   | Yes.   |
| 2. Aylesworth, (M.D.), A. K., Newburgh :<br>No.   | No.   | Yes.   |
| 3. Beeman, M. J., (M.B.), Univ. Toronto :<br>Although in favour of University Federation, would be well satisfied to see Queen's remain outside.                  | No.   | Have not read report.  |
| 4. Burson, Rev. Geo., St. Catharines :<br>Decidedly not.  | No.   | Yes.   |
| 5. Cameron, Rev. Hugh, Watford :<br>No; it would be a great mistake to do so. Queen's has a work to do she can only accomplish in Kingston.                       | Not one cent.   | Yes.   |



6. Cumberland, (M.D.), T., Camlache :  
 No. I would not. I certainly am.
7. Carmichael, Rev. James, Strange :  
 No ; I think such a step No ; would much rather Yes. I can say amen to  
 would be disastrous to the assist to keep her where this with all my heart.  
 future prospects of Queen's. she is.
8. Craig, Rev. Robt. John, Deseronto :  
 No. No. Yes.
9. Clinton, George, Deseronto :  
 No. No. Yes.
10. Cumberland, Rev. J., Stella :  
 No, the east is the home No, because to do so would Yes, and I hope that the  
 of the wise men. be a breach of faith, and an final answer of the friends  
 act of injustice to Eastern of Queen's to the question  
 Ontario. of federation, will be a  
 quarter of a million added  
 to endowment fund.
11. Duff, J. M., Parkhill :  
 No. No. Yes.
12. Dingman, W. E., Listowel, Perth :  
 No. No. Yes.
13. Dimma, James, Belford :  
 No. No. Yes.
14. Duff, (M.D.), Ramsay H., Newburgh :  
 Decidedly no. No. Yes.
15. Dickson, (M.D.) Charles R., Wolf Island :  
 Most emphatically no. Neither ready nor willing. I generally favour the  
 views and especially favour  
 the last clause.
16. Forrester, Edgar, Algonquin, Grenville :  
 No. I would not. Yes.
17. Fraser, (M.D.), R. M., Westmeath, Renfrew :  
 Never. No. Yes.
18. Emery, (M.D.), S. A. J., Croswell, Mich. :  
 No. I think Queen's I would never give a I certainly do, and believe  
 should remain where she is, single dollar towards mov- that every graduate of  
 she has held her own and ing Queen's to Toronto. Queen's should try and  
 can do so through all time. But if she remains in King- build up the place of their  
 ston I shall support her as education. Stand firm by  
 far as I am able. their Alma Mater.
19. Hume, John P., Dunnville :  
 Am not in favour of Would with treble the Am heartily in favour of  
 Queen's giving up her uni- pleasure assist in keeping the views of the Board of  
 versity powers, and am de- her where she is. Trustees.  
 cidedly opposed to Queen's  
 moving to Toronto.
20. Klewes, George, Brucefield :  
 No. No. Yes.
21. Mullan, E., Kilsyth, Grey :  
 Decidedly not. Decidedly not. Decidedly I do.

22. Macauley, Rev. Evan, Creiff P. O., Wellington :

I am not in favour of Queen's University entering into any proposed confederation of colleges, or giving up the power she enjoys by Royal Charter, and move to Toronto or any other place.

I would not assist in moving the University from Kingston, or help in defraying any expenses incurred by any such action.

I favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in their Report of 13th January, that Queen's University remain permanently at Kingston, and efforts made to build it up and extend its usefulness more and more.

23. Miller, L. F. Woodhill :

No.

No.

Yes.

24. McPhaedyen, Hugh, Cresswell :

By no means.

By neither exertion nor sympathy.

Certainly.

Removal would be a gross injustice to Kingston, and to the claims of other parts of the Province which are equal to those of Toronto.

Universities should be independent for every reason. I hope that confederation in the sense of removal to one centre shall never be brought about.

25. Newton, (M.D.), John, Deseronto :

No.

No.

Yes.

26. Prie, (M.D.), R. B., Bath :

No.

No.

Yes.

27. Neill, Robert, Burnbrae :

I am not.

I would not.

I do.

28. Rouse, Mark R. :

No.

Never.

Yes.

Why don't they propose to take the High Schools to Toronto ; or let all the Ontario population move there bodily. It is all right for Government to try to raise the standard of general education, *but* Queen's College is not an offspring of Canadian Government's begetting, and it has standards of thought, of culture and modes of culture that are designed to educate the people and government as well. This being so, Queen's College can't stoop to be drilled, developed, shaped by the Government, though that Government should see it to be its duty and privilege to give it all the requisite pecuniary aid. It is impossible for Queen's to give up all its traditions and go into a false position in Toronto—nothing but ignorance can excuse people making so base a proposal.

29. Smith, Rev. Wm. S., Centreville :

I am not.

No.

Yes.

30. Tulloch, James, West Huntingdon, Hastings :

I am not.

No.

I do.

31. Thompson, Rev. Dr. Robt., Niagara Falls :

Emphatically, I say no ; neither necessary nor expedient, and in my judgment an extinction of Queen's University.

I would exert every effort to preserve Queen's University, but my efforts might not avail much.

Yes ; I have read the Trustees' Report very carefully, and, as a member of a Scottish University (Edinburgh), I am confident its views are accurate, wise and statesmanlike.

32. Ross, Walter, Picton :

No.

No.

Yes.

33. Scott, John, Hensall :

No.

No.

Yes.

34. Wallen, Wm., Elfield :

No.

No.

Yes.

## FROM PORT ARTHUR AND MANITOBA.

*To Question No. 1.*

Are you in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation of Colleges, giving up the University powers she enjoys by Royal Charter, and moving to Toronto?

*To Question No. 2.*

As a large expenditure would be required to transfer the University from Kingston, would you be ready to assist in such work?

*To Question No. 3.*

Do you generally favour the views of the Board of Trustees as expressed in the report of the 13th January, 1885, that the University should remain permanently at Kingston, and that every effort should be made to build it up and extend its usefulness?

*Answers to Questions*

## I.

1. Cumberland, T. D., Winnipeg:  
No.

## II.

I should prefer giving what I could towards building Queen's up where she is.

## III.

Yes, generally.

2. Chown (M.D.), Winnipeg:

Strongly opposed to the transfer of Queen's from Kingston to Toronto.

3. Herald, Rev. James, Port Arthur:

I certainly am not.

I would not, but will heartily assist in opposing it.

I heartily endorse the views of the Trustees, expressed in their report. To remove Queen's from Kingston would be unfair to that city, unfair to Central Ontario, and a breach of the understanding upon which much of the money was contributed to its endowment.

4. Hart, Rev. Thomas, Winnipeg:

I am not in favour of Queen's entering the proposed confederation, if there is a reasonable prospect that she will receive such increased financial support as will enable her to compete as successfully with any University that may be established in Toronto, as the result of the proposed confederation scheme, as she now competes with the Universities as at present constituted.

If, after all, the Trustees should consider it advisable to transfer the University from Kingston to Toronto, I would assist such an undertaking as I might be able.

I favour generally the views of the Board of Trustees on this question.

5. McLaren, J. B., Nelson, Man.:

No.

Not to the amount of one dollar.

Yes.

6. McConnell (M.D.), B. G., Nelson:

No.

Not to the amount of one dollar.

Yes.

N. B.—The report of the Trustees of date, January 13, 1885, to which reference is made in the above replies, is herewith appended:—

THE REPORT ADOPTED BY THE TRUSTEES ON THE MEMORANDUM OF THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, EMBRACING A SCHEME FOR THE CONFEDERATION OF THE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.

The memorandum is of a very important character. The committee regard it as the expression of an earnest desire on the part of the Minister of Education, and the Government whom he represents, to promote by a comprehensive measure the interests of higher education throughout the Province. It is certainly an invitation to Queen's University, along with the other seats of learning in Ontario, to participate in a public expenditure on terms set forth in the scheme. The committee recognize this desire on the part of the Minister and the Government, and are of opinion that the authorities of the University should be grateful for the expression of this aim and intention to stimulate higher education. It is with no little satisfaction that the committee notices in the scheme a practical recognition that Queen's is doing no inconsiderable part of the university work of Ontario.

Without entering at this stage into the details of the scheme, it is obvious that to accept the invitation now offered, and participate in the advantages of the proposed union, two things are required. It is indispensably necessary that the whole establishment of Queen's University should be removed from Kingston to Toronto, and that the university powers now enjoyed under Royal Charter should be held in abeyance.

The transfer to Toronto is no easy matter. It is estimated that a quarter of a million of dollars would be needed to establish Queen's in Toronto on the same scale as at present. This may or may not be an over-estimate, but the trustees have not at their command any sum which they could divert to such a purpose. Queen's is endowed and supported by private benefactions. All funds are actively employed in promoting the work of education, and in order to move to Toronto it would be absolutely necessary to raise money specially for that purpose. Until this is done the committee could not recommend the trustees to accept the invitation to enter the confederation. There are other considerations which weigh with the committee. A large portion of the endowment and building fund was obtained for Queen's University at Kingston, and removal to Toronto would be considered by many a breach of the understanding upon which the funds were subscribed.

The friends and supporters of Queen's have always felt the need of a university in Eastern Ontario. Such a seat of learning has a powerful influence in inducing young men to enter upon university life. It has an incalculable influence in promoting the development of merit and genius throughout a wide surrounding district. Many a student comes to Kingston who would not go to Toronto at all. This advantage would be lost to the eastern half of Ontario if Queen's were moved away from Kingston, and the cause of higher education would proportionately suffer. Again, Kingston is regarded as a place peculiarly suitable for a university seat. In a great city the university, however imposing it may be made, can never be a dominant feature. The mercantile interests will always overshadow the educational. But in Kingston the University is the dominant feature. Its influence pervades the whole atmosphere. Again, students can live at a cheaper rate—a most important consideration to many; and what is of vast importance to all, they are not exposed to the temptations of a large city. Queen's has undoubtedly a power of usefulness in Kingston which she could never have if moved elsewhere. To move would sever Queen's from traditions, associations and affections; and by what so much as these does any college live and grow?

The Committee hold the view that the interests of the public and the cause of higher education in the Province of Ontario will be immensely better served by the existence of two or more well-equipped universities than by having only one. It is not an advantage to have all the educated men of the country cast in the same mould. Several centres of education result in distinctive features of teaching. As Scotland has been a great gainer by the contributions of thought given to her sons by her four universities, so also would Canada by having more than one. The four universities of Scotland were established when Scotland had less than half the population which Ontario now numbers. The seats of learning, Glasgow, Edinburgh, St. Andrew's and Aberdeen, have long been famous. They are all situated at points some forty miles apart. They are all in part state supported. When the Government recently proposed to reduce the number by obliterating



the smallest, St. Andrew's, an indignant protest arose from one end of the country to the other, and to-day a fifth is being established to meet the intellectual wants of a population only one half larger than that of Ontario. Scotland is justly celebrated for her system of higher education and her universities, and the success which they have achieved is the strongest testimony we can have that Ontario should have more than one.

At the present moment the universities of Scotland are attended by over six thousand students while Ontario, with two-thirds of the population, has under fifteen hundred. The proportion of the Scotch universities would give to Ontario four thousand students. To have such a number of students congregated at one university seat would for many reasons be undesirable. Similar remarks will apply to Germany, perhaps the most economical and best educated country in the world. Numerous universities in the United States are being endowed to an unprecedented extent by benefactions from private individuals, who recognize the healthy influence which is exercised upon the whole community by a sufficient number of flourishing centres of learning in various districts. The nearest approach to centralization has been in England; but even there the rivalry of Oxford and Cambridge has had a beneficial influence, and it is now admitted that the benefit would have been greater had there been more than two centres of thought. More recently England has added the universities of Durham, London and Victoria, and to-day, colleges richly endowed are springing up in every section of England and Wales.

For the various reasons set forth, the committee are unable to recommend that the trustees should resolve to enter the proposed union. There are other reasons of a special character which need not be alluded to. One thing is perfectly obvious to the committee. The true interests of the country and especially the cause of higher education in Eastern Ontario requires that Queen's College should remain fixed to her moorings. If Scotland has for centuries supported four famous universities, Ontario with her two millions of intelligent people requires at least two well equipped centres of higher education. While the existence of these institutions would lead to a generous rivalry, productive of activity and excellence, it is to be feared that were there only one, it might relapse into a state of lethargy, from which would result only dulness and mediocrity.

These are the views of the committee, and as far as ascertained, they are the views of every graduate and benefactor of the university. But as Queen's is supported by private beneficence it is only right to consult all its constituents throughout the Dominion before final action is taken concerning the scheme submitted to the board.

The committee recommends that a respectful representation be made to the Government embodying the views of the authorities of Queen's University regarding the policy of higher education in Ontario, and the necessity imposed on them of delay till the Convocation, to be held in April next, before taking final action on the memorandum submitted by the Minister. They desire also to express their satisfaction that the wisdom of enlisting in university work private and denominational liberality, as well as public endowment and grants, is recognized in the memorandum. This policy, the committee submit, cannot possibly be limited to one locality. When there has grown up, in a great measure through sacrifices made by the people of Eastern Ontario, a university like Queen's, the policy must be applied to this section of the country, unless the resources of the province are to be brought into unfair competition with the proved necessities of a section of the province. Otherwise, the State would be seeking to crush local effort, and local effort for the public benefit of the most generous and persistent kind.

In the opinion of the committee, then, a recognition by the Government of Queen's University and of the necessities of Eastern Ontario is required in a just and comprehensive measure of higher education. As to the form that this recognition should assume the committee do not at this stage express an opinion. They do not doubt that the Government will recognize the justice of what they have advanced, and in that case a way of combining public and private liberality in university work can be found in Kingston as well as in Toronto. They recommend that a deputation be appointed to wait upon the Government to confer with it regarding the whole subject.

In conclusion, the committee desire to thank the Minister of Education for the attention which he is giving to the all-important subject of higher education in Ontario.

(Signed,)

SANDFORD FLEMING,  
Chairman of Committee.

---

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT MEETINGS HELD DURING CONVOCATION  
WEEK AT KINGSTON, APRIL, 1885.

No. 1.—Resolution passed at the special meeting of all interested in Queen's University, in Convocation Hall, 28th April, 1885.

No. 2.— do do do do

No. 3.—Adopted by the University Council in reference to University Confederation, April 29th, 1885.

No. 4.—Adopted by the University Council in reference to the organization of Queen's University Endowment Association, April 29th, 1885.

No. 5.— do do do do

No. 6.— do do do do

No. 7.— do do do do

No. 8.— do do do do

No. 9.—Final resolution passed by the Board of Trustees in reference to University Confederation, April 30th, 1885.

No. 10.—Resolution of the Board of Trustees in reference to the institution of Queen's University Endowment Association, April 30th, 1885.

---

No. 1.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE SPECIAL MEETING OF ALL INTERESTED  
IN QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, IN THE CONVOCATION HALL, APRIL  
28TH, 1885.

Moved by Rev. James Barclay, M.A., of Montreal, seconded by Mr. George Gillies, B.A., of Gananoque, and resolved:

That this meeting is of the unanimous opinion that the authorities of Queen's should now determine that the University shall forever remain at Kingston.

No. 2.

Moved by Rev. G. M. Milligan, B.A., of Toronto, seconded by Judge Macdonald, of Brockville, and resolved:

That the thanks of this meeting be tendered to the Chancellor for his admirable address, and for the great trouble he has taken to ascertain the views of graduates and friends of the College on the subject of University Confederation; and that the University Council be requested to consider the advisability of forming an association, whose duty it shall be in every possible way to further the interests and increase the efficiency of this University.

---

No. 3.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL IN REFERENCE  
TO UNIVERSITY CONFEDERATION, APRIL 29TH, 1885.

Moved by Dr. Gibson, of Belleville, seconded by Rev. R. J. Laidlaw, of Hamilton, and resolved:

The Council have heard the report of the Chancellor with regard to the views of the graduates and benefactors of the University on the subject of University Confederation, resolves in accordance therewith.

(1) That it would be neither in the interest of Queen's nor in the interest of higher education in Canada that Queen's should abdicate her University powers or remove from Kingston.

(2) That the report of the trustees, adopted 13th January, 1885, expresses generally the views of the Council.

(3) That in the opinion of the Council it is the duty of the Government in any appropriation for University work to recognize the large share of such work done by Queen's as a University at Kingston.

(4) That the Chancellor's report be adopted, and that a copy of the report, together with these resolutions, be sent to the trustees for their information regarding the attitude of the University Council on the matter of the proposed Confederation.

---

No. 4.

IN REFERENCE TO THE ORGANIZATION OF "QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY  
ENDOWMENT ASSOCIATION."

Moved by Rev. Dr. Smith, of St. John, N. B., seconded by Mr. A. T. Drummond, L.L.B., of Montreal, and resolved :

That the suggestion of the Chancellor with regard to the formation of an association for increasing the endowment and promoting the efficiency of the University be adopted.

No. 5.

Moved by Mr. G. M. Macdonnell, Q.C., of Kingston, seconded by Rev. R. J. Laidlaw, of Hamilton, and resolved :

That the association to be organized be called the Queen's University Endowment Association.

No. 6.

Moved by Rev. G. M. Milligan, of Toronto, seconded by Rev. E. D. McLaren, of Brampton, and resolved :

That Mr. Sandford Fleming, C.M.G., LL.D., be President of the Association.

No. 7.

Moved by Rev. R. J. Laidlaw, of Hamilton, Seconded by Mr. A. T. Drummond, L.L.B., of Montreal, and resolved :

That the objects of the association shall be to increase the efficiency of the University by adding to the Endowment, providing for the establishment of new scholarships, lectureships and chairs, and in every possible way enlisting and securing public sympathy and support.

No. 8.

Moved by Rev. Dr. Smith, of St. John N. B., seconded by Judge Macdonald, of Brockville, and resolved :

That Mr. R. V. Rogers, Mr. John Carruthers and Mr. G. M. Macdonnell, Q.C., Kingston; Mr. A. T. Drummond, L.L.B., and Rev. James Barclay, Montreal; Rev. J. C. Smith, B. D. Guelph; Dr. Gibson and Mr. John Bell, Q.C., Belleville; Dr. Malloch and Mr. M. Leggatt, Hamilton; Mr. George Gillies, Gananoque; Dr. Grant, Ottawa; Mr. D. B. Maclellan, Q.C., Cornwall; Mr. James Maclellan, Q.C., and Rev. G. M. Milligan, Toronto; Rev. Dr. Campbell, Renfrew; Rev. M. McGillivray, Perth; with the mover and seconder, and with power to add to their number, be a Committee to organize the Association and carry out its objects.



## No. 9.

FINAL RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, APRIL 30TH, 1885, IN REFERENCE TO THE SCHEME OF UNIVERSITY CONFEDERATION SUBMITTED BY THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION OF ONTARIO.

Moved by Rev. Dr. Wardrope, of Guelph, seconded by Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, of Toronto, and resolved :

That the final reply of the Board of Trustees be transmitted to the Honorable the Minister of Education, regarding the scheme of University Confederation submitted by him, as follows :—

At the last meeting of the Board a report was adopted expressing the views of the Trustees as a body on the memorandum of the Minister of Education embracing a scheme for the confederation of the Universities and Colleges of the Province of Ontario. For reasons then expressed the Trustees felt it incumbent upon them to delay taking final action until the present Convocation. The report of the Board, dated 13th January, was duly communicated to the Minister of Education for the information of himself and the Government.

On January 23rd a deputation consisting of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, Rev. D. J. McDonnell, B.D., Rev. G. M. Milligan, B.A., Rev. R. J. Laidlow, and James Maclellan, Q.C., by appointment waited on the Minister of Education and the Attorney-General at the office of the latter in Toronto, and at that interview explained further the views of the Board of Trustees.

On 9th February a public meeting was held in the City Hall, Kingston, at which resolutions were passed giving expression on the subject of Queen's entering the confederation. Other meetings were held at Harrowsmith, Perth, Seymour, Deseronto, and other places in the adjoining counties, at which similar action was taken. The County Council of Frontenac passed a resolution of the same tenor. At the meeting in Kingston a deputation, consisting of the Mayor and leading citizens of Kingston and Gananoque, was appointed to submit and explain their views and the results of the meeting to the Minister of Education and his colleagues.

Steps have since been taken to ascertain the views of all the constituents of Queen's University. Yesterday the Chancellor submitted a report to the Council, and the day previous to a special meeting held in Convocation Hall of all interested in the University. This report, which sets forth the opinions of representative men from all parts of the country on the University Consolidation scheme, together with the resolutions passed by the special meeting and by the Council, establish that the constituency of Queen's is practically a unit in favor of declining to enter the proposed confederation, and of Queen's remaining permanently at Kingston as a University. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees most respectfully decline to enter into the proposed confederation of Universities and Colleges at Toronto, and they request the Chancellor to transmit this their reply, and at the same time to transmit his report and the resolutions referred to herein for the information of the Minister of Education and his colleagues.

## No. 10.

IN REFERENCE TO THE FORMATION OF "QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT ASSOCIATION."

Moved by Mr. W. C. Caldwell, M.P.P., of Lanark, seconded by Mr. D. B. Maclellan, Q.C., of Cornwall, and resolved :

That the Trustees are greatly encouraged in their efforts to promote the advancement and progress of Queen's College by the action of the University Council in forming a Queen's University Endowment Association, and while cordially approving of the action taken by the Council commend the object to the support and sympathy of the friends of the University.





